

32

THE INVESTIGATOR,

AND

ADVOCATE OF INDEPENDENCE.

SCIENCE, RELIGION, LITERATURE, ETC.

VOL. II.

JANUARY, 1846.

No. 1.

RELIGION.

ROMAN CATHOLIC MARYLAND.

"Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?"

A MEMBER of that sect which claims all the Christianity, writing in the *Union* of the 13th October, over the signature of "*A True Marylander*," uses the following language:

"Maryland, I need not say, was founded by English Catholics," [meaning *Roman*, by the word "*English*,"] "who, flying from persecution at home, raised in America the standard of religious and civil liberty, and were the first to proclaim, in the British colonies, the freedom of conscience, which Protestant states were denying them in the Old World."

Had the writer said that *a Protestant king allowed the Roman Catholics in the British colonies the freedom of conscience which was denied them at home*, he would have left us little ground for controversy. As it is, we must deny the *historical correctness* of his statement. The truth is, it was the Protestant king CHARLES I who permitted Lord BALTIMORE to raise in Maryland the standard of religious and civil liberty, affording protection to the Papist and the Protestant.

We have already shown, in a previous number, (February,) by extracts from the old Maryland charter itself, that the Roman Catholics of Maryland were not entitled to the least credit for the religious toleration observed under the proprietary government; and, as those extracts are short, we will here repeat them.

In the 7th section—after granting the power of legislation to the Lord proprietary and freemen—there is a *proviso*, in these words:

“So, nevertheless, that the laws aforesaid be consonant to reason, and be not repugnant or contrary, but (as far as conveniently may be) agreeable to the laws, statutes, customs, and rights of this our kingdom of England.”

This is repeated in the 8th section. In section 22, in relation to the *interpretation* of the laws or decisions of the courts, we find these words:

“*Provided, always, that no interpretation thereof be made, whereby God’s holy and true Christian religion, or the allegiance due to us, our heirs and successors, may in anywise suffer, by change, prejudice, or diminution.*”

Any act of intolerance, therefore, or decision of a court prejudicial to the exercise of that religion which the Protestant government of Great Britain considered “*God’s holy and true Christian religion,*” would have been a violation of their charter, and have subjected them to the displeasure of that government, which had the power, and might not have wanted the disposition, to deprive them of all those cherished privileges which that charter conferred.

A respected friend, in reference to our remarks on this subject in the February number of this work, (pages 63 and 64,) has called our attention to certain passages of Mr. BANCROFT’S History of the United States, which will presently follow, and which, he thinks, militate strongly against the view we have taken of the subject. We thank our friend sincerely, as an occasion is thus afforded for a re-examination of the history of the times, and a revision of our own remarks, as well as an opportunity to correct an error which (writing from memory) we discover we did commit.

We stated that the Maryland charter was *prepared* in the lifetime of JAMES I. This is not correct. The grant from King JAMES to CALVERT of the province of Avalon, in Newfoundland, and which he was compelled by French Roman Catholics to abandon, was doubtless at the same time indistinctly in our view, and led to the mistake. It was, however, not material to the issue. Our main object was to show that it was only reasonable to suppose that a Protestant king, on granting a province to a Roman Catholic, would be careful to guard the rights of his Protestant subjects who might settle there, and not to clothe the grantee with power to persecute them, should he be so disposed; and that such, indeed, was the fact in respect of the case in question. But Mr. BANCROFT seems disposed to give all the credit for those salutary provisions to the Roman Catholic grantee, rather than the Protestant grantor—on the supposition, it would also seem,

that the grantee could have obtained anything he saw fit to demand, to the extent even of power to oppress, burn, and destroy all of the king's Protestant subjects who might dare to venture within the limits of the charter. If this is not to be inferred, we confess our inability to discover the object of such high encomiums as are bestowed upon the grantee for the just and tolerant provisions of that instrument.

In vol. 1, p. 241, Mr. BANCROFT says:

"The nature of the document itself, and concurrent opinion, leave no room to doubt that it was penned by Lord BALTIMORE himself."

This is not improbable; but it is not to be supposed that it received the king's signature and seal without undergoing the scrutiny of the privy council, or his own inspection. Sir GEORGE CALVERT had been near the crown long enough, and he well enough understood the sensitiveness of CHARLES in relation to his prerogative, and also the state of the public mind, to know how to limit his demands. Nevertheless, no one knows that his original draft of the charter did not contain articles which were rejected by the privy council, and that others were substituted which he would rather had been omitted.

Again, vol. 1, pp. 242, 243, Mr. BANCROFT says:

"Sir GEORGE CALVERT was a Roman Catholic, yet far from guarding his territory against any but those of his persuasion: as he had taken from himself and his successors all arbitrary power, by establishing the legislative franchises of the people, so he took from them the means of being intolerant in religion.

Here Mr. BANCROFT admits almost everything—certainly the principal thing—for which we contend, namely: *that the colonists had no power to oppress and persecute Protestants.* This being conceded, no one will pretend that any praise is due to them for not persecuting.

"*Far from guarding his territory against any but those of his own persuasion, he took from himself and his successors all arbitrary power.*" It would seem to us more natural for *the party making the grant* to impose the restrictions; and there is certainly no evidence of the contrary. Neither is it in the least degree probable that a charter could have been obtained without such restrictions.

"CALVERT," says Mr. BANCROFT, (vol. 1, pp. 244, 245,) "deserves to be ranked among the most wise and benevolent lawgivers of all ages. He was the first in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice, and not by the exercise of power; to plan the establishment of popular institutions with the enjoyment of liberty of conscience; to advance the career of civilization by recognising the rightful equality of all Christian sects."

We have no disposition, were we able, to cast a shade over the virtues of Sir George Calvert. We are willing to concede all that is said

of his wisdom, his benevolence, and his justice;* but we must contend that, being a Roman Catholic, he could not have entertained a reasonable hope of obtaining more than he got. If the charter exists as he originally penned it, it certainly shows that he well knew the terms necessary to his success. Whether those terms were the offspring of his own mind and heart, or the result of conversations and conferences previously had with the king and privy counsellors, no one at this day can tell. How can any one suppose it was possible for him to obtain such extraordinary stipulations as would have excluded Protestants from the colony, or deprived them, when admitted, of the enjoyment of equal rights with the Roman Catholic colonists? Reverse the case for a moment. Suppose a Protestant, during the short reign of JAMES II, had applied to that Roman Catholic sovereign for a grant similar to that of Lord BALTIMORE. The king might have said, Make out the stipulations; we would see what terms you desire. Now, can we suppose a Protestant so stupid as to propose, in his draft of a charter, provisions for the exclusion or disfranchisement of Roman Catholics? No. On the contrary, he would have been exceedingly careful to place them at least on an equality with all other sects—well knowing that any expression savoring of a disposition to oppress or degrade the sect of which the king himself was a member, would be met, not only with the frustration of his purpose, but also with indignation and rebuke, if not with the severest chastisement. In the case of Lord BALTIMORE—he knew that CHARLES was a high churchman; his queen a Papist; and a large body of the people, if not the majority, were puritans, loudly expressing their discontent with the arbitrary power of the crown and its Romish tendency; and that a quarrel between the king and Parliament was already threatened, the consequence of which could not then be foreseen. In view of all these circumstances, CALVERT'S grant seems to have been admirably adapted to the times. To have asked for less, would have evinced unbecoming timidity, and a want of proper regard for his own people; to have asked for more, would have been presumptuous and disrespectful, and attended with inevitable defeat. On the whole, we are unable to discover any grounds for the opinion—if it is entertained by any—that a charter could have been obtained giving more power to the proprietary

* It is, nevertheless, certain, that CLAYBORNE and his people, who had made a settlement by royal authority on Kent island, in the Chesapeake, some time previous to Lord BALTIMORE'S grant, experienced great injustice and persecution from the colonial government.

and his Roman Catholic followers, and less liberty to the Protestant part of his colonists. If this be so—and we do not see how it can be disputed—wherein lies the wonderful merit of Lord BALTIMORE, so extolled by many besides Mr. BANCROFT?

“And there, too, the Protestants were sheltered against Protestant intolerance.”—vol. 1, p. 248.

Yes, truly. It was *Protestant* intolerance—the fruit of *principles inherited from the Church of Rome*—that forced the Plymouth pilgrims to set the example soon *followed* by CALVERT.

But the puritans, it is said, as soon as they acquired power in the colony, enacted oppressive and intolerant laws against the Papists. That is true; and we will not be found to be their apologists, any farther than to observe, that in those days there seems to have been an incessant struggle between religious sects for *power*—may we not add, to oppress all others? It was the doctrine of the day—as it still is in some Protestant and all purely Roman Catholic countries—that church and state must be united; that the civil government must be influenced in its operations by an established church; and that one religious sect only should exist in a state. Consequently, when opposing sects became strong, they commenced a struggle for the mastery. *Power*, when not sought purely in self-defence, was their religion,—*power* was the god they worshipped. Mr. BANCROFT says truly that the Maryland colonists, under the proprietary government, *had no power to persecute*. Had the Roman Catholic portion possessed the power, and been confident of protection in the exercise thereof, is there a mortal man, in the least degree acquainted with the Papal hierarchy, who does not *know* that every spark of Protestantism in the colony would have been extinguished, without mercy?

We discover that some editors of newspapers, who ought to know better—among them the editor of the New York Herald—have recently been singing this same old song of *Roman Catholic toleration in the colony of Maryland*. This is not a little surprising, as no history, we believe, of that colony, justifies such a conclusion. A few passages in McMAHON'S History of Maryland have been thought to do so; but, when carefully examined, and compared with other parts of the same work, quite the contrary appears.

McMAHON (vol. 1, p. 193) says:

“Her colonists, in escaping from the proscriptions and persecutions of the mother country, unlike those of some of the puritan settlements of the North, did not catch the contagion of the spirit which had driven them from their homes.”

And why? Because all were on an equality under the charter, and one sect had no more power than another. No law could be enacted without the concurrence of the proprietary; and an act of intolerance would have been a violation of his charter, and rendered it liable to revocation. We find this sentiment expressed by the same historian, (page 244,) and which we will presently give at large. But *they did persecute the Quakers*, (page 227;) which they could do with impunity—that sect being averse to resistance, and having no friend in the world, at that time, able or disposed to redress their wrongs.

Again—in note to page 195—he says :

“When the howlings of religious persecution were heard everywhere around them, the Catholic and Protestant of Maryland were seen mingling in harmony in the discharge of all their public and private duties, under a free government, which assured the rights of conscience to all.” “We can turn with exultation to the pilgrims of Maryland as the founders of religious liberty in the New World. They erected the first altar to it on this continent.”

In all this, it will be perceived, Mr. McMAHON never speaks of the Maryland pilgrims as Roman Catholics, because they were not exclusively so; for, in page 194, he says they “consisted of about two hundred persons, *principally* Roman Catholics.” The Protestant portion enjoyed, under the charter, the same privileges, and of course were entitled to as much credit as the rest for the toleration enjoyed. But, really, we are not sufficiently astute to perceive how any of them can be entitled to the least credit for privileges *granted to them*, and which might have been denied. Their descendants of the present day are as much entitled to commendation for the resolution and adventure of their pilgrim fathers, as are the latter for the freedom they enjoyed under King CHARLES’s grant to Lord BALTIMORE. They were fortunate, indeed, in being so highly favored, at such a time; and they merit commendation for following the noble example which had been set them by the Brownists. These, truly, fled from oppression in their native land, and braved the dangers of a boisterous ocean, in search of religious liberty. But what oppression did the Roman Catholics endure under CHARLES I, when his queen was a Papist, and the archbishop himself a *Puseyite*? Indeed, the tendency of the established church and the nobility was strong, at that time, towards Rome. There is an anecdote which occurs to us, told by HUME, corroborative of this assertion. A lady of high rank very unexpectedly joined the Church of Rome. The archbishop (LAUD) expressed his surprise, and asked her the reason of her sudden conversion. She told him, it was because she disliked a crowd. Not fully comprehending her

meaning, he asked her to explain; when she replied, that she saw them all preparing, as fast as possible, to go to Rome, and, as she disliked going in a crowd, she had only started a little ahead.

Mr. McMAHON never attempts to show that the Roman Catholic part of the colonists were more highly favored by the charter than the Protestant. This he could not do. True, on the arrival of the first settlers, the Roman Catholics were more numerous than the Protestants: but it seems that it did not so continue very long; for we learn that in about ten years after the first landing was effected at St. Mary's, CLAYBORNE and INGLE organized a party, in opposition to the proprietary interests, so powerful as to depose the governor, and assume the management of all the affairs of the colony. Now, it is very certain that this faction was not composed of Roman Catholics; and it is equally certain, that, with such a force in the opposition, the Papists would never have dared to enact a law of religious intolerance, even had they held the legislative power exclusively in their own hands—which they never did.

The usurpers did not continue long in power, and it took several years after the resumption of the reins of government by the legitimate authorities (in 1646) to restore tranquillity and order. In the mean time, great and decisive events were being enacted in England. The friends of the Parliament had been constantly on the increase; the puritans, under CROMWELL, bore down all opposition; the last stronghold of royal power had been reduced; the king himself was a prisoner, and finally, in 1649, was brought to the scaffold. It was in this same year—1649—when, feeling the influence of things in England, the liberty and anti-popery party in Maryland had gained strength and courage, and when the last hope of papal predominance both in England and the colony had expired, and the Roman Catholics realized their perilous condition, and found themselves in the minority here, while their friends in Great Britain were stricken down and powerless—it was at this period, and under these circumstances, when they had all to gain and nothing to lose by it, the Roman Catholic freemen of Maryland gladly united with the Protestant freemen, and passed the bill of full and free toleration to all persons "*professing to believe in Jesus Christ.*" This was, indeed, a noble act *in itself*; but who does not see that it was *extorted* by surrounding circumstances, which placed all papal power and papal liberty in jeopardy—threatening them here with the ruin they had just experienced in Great Britain? Nevertheless, it contrasts gloriously with the act passed just fifty years after, in the plenitude of Protestant power, which subjected all who

should profess such doctrines as are now professed and taught everywhere freely and fearlessly, by Unitarians, Christians, Campbellites, Hicksite Quakers, and the like, to the most cruel and ignominious penalties—such as fine and imprisonment, boring through the tongue, branding, and (for persevering in them) death and confiscation of property.

But who, when he takes a view of the whole ground, can allow the Roman Catholics any credit whatever for this toleration act of 1649, and of which they boast without ceasing, as if it were exclusively their own? Who is so blind—we had almost said, *so stupid*—that he cannot see clearly portrayed in this famous act, *so far as the Papists were concerned in it*, that same consummate selfishness which has ever characterized them as a sect, from the time they started into being—when the bishop of Rome, for sectarian aggrandizement, aided the traitor PHOCAS to wade to the imperial throne through the blood of royalty and of infant innocence—to Pope GREGORY XVI, who, in these latter days, forbids *railroads* to be constructed and *meetings of men of science* to be held in his dominions, and even *medical aid* to be afforded to afflicted non-conformists, and openly *curses and damns* Bible societies and the liberty of the press?

Almost immediately after the passage of this toleration act, the colony of Maryland was subjected to the authority of the puritan commonwealth of England—fifteen years only from the time the first settlers landed at St. Mary's. Not many years after this, the Protestant colonists are spoken of as in the proportion of *thirty to one Papist*. Had they possessed the moral power, we are unable to learn at what period, after the first five years from the time the first settlers landed, the Roman Catholics enjoyed the *physical* power to persecute the rest. And if they had not the ability to persecute, wherein lies the wonderful merit in not persecuting?

It appears, moreover, that this toleration, or something else, gave great displeasure to the Papists of England; for, soon after the accession of JAMES II, he was instigated by a Jesuit (called "Father PETERS") to institute process to deprive the proprietary, though a Roman Catholic, of his charter, and abolish the Maryland government; and nothing prevented him from effecting his object but his sudden and effectual expulsion from the throne and kingdom.

We regard religious persecution, by whatever sect perpetrated, as one of the blackest crimes that can be committed by men; for it blasphemously claims authority from God to violate his holy laws.

Tell us not, in reply, that, as soon as the Protestants possessed ex-

clusively the government in Maryland, they persecuted all who dissented from them. It proves not that the Roman Catholics would not have done the same, had they possessed the power. And thus it was with the first settlers of Massachusetts, compared with those of Maryland: they possessed unlimited power; the Marylanders, as it has already been shown, were circumscribed with charter stipulations, and were expressly enjoined against acts of intolerance.

It were a hopeless undertaking to designate the sect—unless it be the Friends—that did not persecute others when it could do so with impunity. They only can be called *tolerant* who, having the power to oppress opponents, treat them kindly. And this leads us to the observations of McMAHON* which we promised above to present to our readers, and with which, excepting a brief summary of what we undertake to establish, we will close this article.

“The profession and exercise of the Christian religion, in all its modes, was open to all. No church was established; all were protected; none were taxed to sustain a church to whose tenets they were opposed; and the people gave freely, as a *benevolence*, what they would have loathed as a *tax*. *Perhaps this was not entirely owing to the spirit of toleration.* The fallen and corrupt nature of man is ever warring against this spirit; and it requires all the efforts of reason, and the injunctions of the gospel, to retain us in steady obedience to its gentle dictates. In the midst of sorrow and suffering, to forgive our oppressors, is an effort to which human nature is seldom equal: yet even this does not so task the purity and benignity of the heart *as the hour of power and triumph.* Of all the sects and parties which have ever divided men, how few are there who, in that hour, beholding their adversaries prostrate at their feet, have wholly forgiven the injuries of the past, or have stooped to assuage their sorrows, and to win them from their errors by the language of kindness and persuasion! *The proprietary dominion had never known that hour. The Protestant religion was the established religion of the mother country; and any effort on the part of the proprietaries to oppress its followers, would have drawn down destruction upon their own government.* The great body of the colonists were themselves Protestants; and, by their numbers, and their participation in the legislative power, they were fully equal to their own protection, and too powerful for the proprietaries, in the event of an open collision. *The safety of the latter was therefore identified with a system of religious toleration.*”

The patient reader will not fail to see that, in this passage, Mr. McMAHON agrees with us in every point we aim to establish, namely: that the lords proprietaries and their Roman Catholic colonists *never possessed the power* to enact laws opposed to religious toleration in the colony of Maryland; that, had they possessed the numerical strength, and done so, it would have been a violation of the charter, and might have caused its revocation, and the annihilation of their government;

* Hist. Md., vol. 1, pp. 243, 244.

that the principles of toleration engrafted in the charter were the best safeguard of the rights of the proprietaries, and that their *interests* required that they should be acted out in the government of the colony. These points being established—and we feel confident that the impartial reader will agree with us that they are—it is not possible that any merit can attach to the Roman Catholics for the absence of oppression and intolerance.

We are aware that we have been guilty of some repetition in this article that might have been avoided. It was designed, as the question is of some consequence, in order that the conclusion might be more firmly impressed upon the minds of the readers.

We hope hereafter to hear no more boasting that the Roman Catholics were the first to proclaim religious toleration in the New World. Would you see Roman Catholic toleration in the New World, look where they have always had abundant power—at South America and Mexico—and *not* to Maryland, where they never had the power to be intolerant.

ROMAN CATHOLIC STATISTICS.

THE first Romish bishop in the United States, JOHN CARROLL of Baltimore, was consecrated in the year 1790. Since that period, the church has gradually but steadily increased, and she now numbers: 1 archbishop, 26 bishops, 675 churches and chapels, 592 stations, 572 clergymen on missions, 137 clergymen otherwise employed, 22 ecclesiastical seminaries, 220 clerical students, 28 literary institutions for the young, 63 female academies, 29 female religious institutions, and 94 charitable institutions. The entire Catholic population in the United States does not fall short of 1,071,000 souls. The literary and educational institutions under the control of the church are as follows: The Holy Cross, in Massachusetts; St. John's, in New Jersey; St. Mary's, Baltimore; Mount St. Mary's, Maryland; Georgetown, D. C.; Spring Hill, Alabama; St. Charles, Louisiana; St. Joseph's, Kentucky; St. Mary's, Kentucky; St. Xavier, Ohio; St. Gabriel, Indiana; University of St. Louis, Missouri; St. Mary's, Missouri; and St. Philip's, Michigan.

So great has the influence of the Papal church become in some of the older States of the Union, that successful efforts have been made

to exclude the Holy Scriptures from our primary schools, and thus reject from our system of public education that blessed book which lies at the foundation of every Christian code, save that of apostate Rome.

In the great valley of the Mississippi—that rich garden of the western continent—colleges, seminaries, convents, and asylums have recently been established, mostly by foreign funds; and gigantic efforts are now being made to train the rising generation in the superstitions of Popery.

In the far West, from the mouth of the Columbia river to the first South American settlements, nothing but Papacy is known. All the old Spanish towns, and most of the inland frontier settlements, occupied by half-breed French, are under the ecclesiastical dominion of the church.

It is stated by the editor of the London Review, that should the Roman Catholic church in the United States increase for the next thirty as she has done for the last eight years, the Papists will constitute a majority of the whole people, and, as a matter of course, the Pope will become the supreme ruler. Since 1836, the church has nearly doubled herself.

When we look abroad over the field once occupied by the Reformers of the 16th century, what do we there find? In Spain, Portugal, France, Ireland, Austria, Italy, and South America, the hierarchy rules with the iron sway of the leaden ages. In Germany, Prussia, Switzerland, and England, it battles with Protestantism arm to arm. The Protestant King of Prussia is now engaged (says the Free Church Magazine) in finishing the magnificent Cathedral of Cologne. In Russia, the influence of the priests has become so powerful as to call forth the exercise of the very summary authority by which all things are there ruled.

In England, the established church has so far run into the errors of Popery as to induce some of the most eminent of the clergy to forsake the communion of the church, and solemnly swear fealty to Rome. The English government is now engaged in support of the College of Maynooth—an institution designed for the clerical education of Romish students.

According to the Metropolitan Catholic Almanac for 1844, the Roman Catholic church throughout the world numbers 65 cardinals, 12 patriarchs, 147 archbishops, 584 bishops, 71 vicariates, 9 prefecturas, 95 coadjutors, 3,627 missionaries, and 160,842,424 souls. The number of the lower secular clergy, and of the regular clergy, is not given.

Thus, at a glance, the reader may see the influence and power of the Roman hierarchy, and its rapid spread over the world. We cannot close our eyes to the consequences which must result from the rise and supremacy of Papacy: the history of the church lies before us—a history of tyranny, cruelty, and death.

H. B.

THE MAXIMS OF CONFUCIUS,
AND
THE MAXIMS OF CHRIST.

THERE is a very marked likeness between the moral maxims of the ancient sages, and many of the familiar axioms of the sacred writers. CONFUCIUS, ZOROASTER, and PUBLIUS SYRUS, closely resemble ST. PAUL, ST. PETER, and ST. JOHN.

There is a noble simplicity, a grandeur of expression, and a peculiar force of language, in the sacred writings, which remove them very far from the compositions of uninspired men. Sublime indeed are these holy meditations; for, while MOSES leads the way, JOHN brings up the rear of the illustrious company. There is, nevertheless, a striking resemblance between the sentiments embodied or shadowed forth in the moral maxims of the Chinese and Persian philosophers, and those of the prophets and apostles.

CONFUCIUS flourished about 550 years before CHRIST. He attained great celebrity for talents and moral worth, and, to the present day, is held in reverence and veneration by the Chinese.

ZOROASTER lived (it is supposed) some 600 years before the SAVIOUR. He is said to have been the founder of the religion of the Magi. The faith of the ancient Persians seems to date back to this celebrated sage.

PURLIUS SYRUS was a contemporary of CICERO. Though a slave, he received his education at Rome. He was noticed by JULIUS CÆSAR, and complimented by CASIUS SEVERUS and AVIERNUS.

To afford some little interest to the curious in theological research, I have selected, almost at random, twenty-four maxims of the ancients, and placed them opposite to twenty-four passages culled from the Holy Scriptures. They embrace many of the most prominent doctrines or peculiarities of both religion and morals. They teach, first of all, the

noble dogma of the existence of a great *First Cause*, called GOD, CREATOR, JEHOVAH; secondly, the necessity of religious worship—a duty most solemnly imposed by the Creator upon man—a duty to be neglected only at the peril of the displeasure and wrath of the Almighty; thirdly, the nature and attributes of the Being we worship; fourthly, the duty of prayer; fifthly, the happiness and peace springing from the possession of a clear conscience, or a conscience “void of offence;” sixthly, the danger of defiling the soul; seventhly, the absolute certainty of future rewards and punishments—the good to inherit life, and the bad to pass into a state of dire bondage and sorrow; eighthly, the moral duties—viz: to do as you would be done by; temperance in all things; the evil of lying and swearing, and the necessity of sustaining the truth; and obeying the laws;—ninthly, the social duties—viz: the cultivation of a meek and quiet spirit; the error of cherishing revenge; the duties of honoring our parents, of curbing our passions, and of paying a proper deference to age.

In regard to the antiquity of these heathen maxims, I must confess that I am disposed to feel rather skeptical. The reader, however, must form his own opinions on this subject.

MAXIMS.

1. “Virtue (or religion) renders the spirit quiet.”—*Confucius*.

“The ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, in the sight of God, is of great price.”—*I Peter, c. 3, v. 4*.

2. “Do unto another as thou wouldst be dealt with thyself.”—*Confucius*.

“Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.”—*Matthew, 7, 12*.

3. “A child is obliged to serve and obey his father.”—*Confucius*.

“Children, obey your parents in all things; for this is well pleasing unto the Lord.”—*Colossians, 3, 20*.

4. “Heaven shortens not the life of man: it is man that does it, by his own crimes.”—*Confucius*.

“Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days.”—*Psalms, 55, 23*.

5. “Temperance is the best physic.”—*Confucius*.

“Every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things.”—*I Corinthians, 9, 25*.

6. “It is the decree of the most just God, that men shall be judged according to the good or evil which they shall have done.”—*Zoroaster*.

“Be not deceived: God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.”—*Galatians*, 6, 7.

7. “Honor thy father and mother, if thou wishest to live eternal life.”—*Zoroaster*.

“Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise.”—*Ephesians*, 6, 2.

8. “Never lie: it is infamous, even when falsehood may be useful.”—*Zoroaster*.

“Lying lips are an abomination unto the Lord.”—*Proverbs*, 12, 22.

9. “The pleasures of this world are but of brief duration.”—*Zoroaster*.

“The fashion of this world passeth away.”—*I Corinthians*, 7, 31.

10. “He who exhorteth men to penitence, ought himself to be blameless.”—*Zoroaster*.

“Lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.”—*I Corinthians*, 9, 27.

11. “Worship God.”—*Solon, of Athens*.

“Worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.”—*I Chronicles*, 16, 29.

12. “Sustain the truth.”—*Solon*.

“Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.”—*John*, 8, 32.

13. “Moderate thine anger.”—*Solon*.

“Let not the sun go down on thy wrath.”—*Ephesians*, 4, 26.

14. “Obey the laws.”—*Solon*.

“Submit yourself to every ordinance of men, for the Lord’s sake.”—*I Peter*, 2, 13.

15. “Do not swear.”—*Solon*.

“Swear not at all.”—*Matthew*, 5, 34.

16. “He who rules his anger, subdues his greatest enemy.”—*Publius Syrus*.

“He that is slow to wrath is of great understanding.”—*Proverbs*, 14, 29.

17. “Desire not the death of thine enemy: thou wouldst desire it in vain: his life is in the hands of Heaven.” “Acknowledge benefits, but never revenge injuries.”—*Confucius*.

“Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven.”—*Matthew*, 5, 44.

18. “God is good and merciful, and full of pity; he forgives on the return of the wicked.”—*Chinese Creed*.

“The Lord is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil.”—*Joshua*, 2, 13.

19. “The most ancient of all things is God.”—*Zoroaster*.

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”—*John*, 1, 1.

20. “In affliction, offer up thy patience (or prayers) to God.”—*Zoroaster*.

“Is any afflicted, let him pray.”—*James*, 5, 13.

21. “Defile not the spirit.”—*Zoroaster*.

“If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy: for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.”—*1 Cor.*, 3, 17.

22. “Seek Paradise.”—*Zoroaster*.

“Seek ye first the kingdom of God.”—*Matthew*, 6, 33.

23. “Honor the aged, and let the youngest always yield to the eldest.”—*Zoroaster*.

“Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves to the elder.”—*Epistle of Paul*.

24. “True happiness causeth the approbation of a good conscience.”—*Zoroaster*.

“I have always a conscience void of offence toward God.”—*Acts*, 24, 16.

The plagiarism, if there be any, in these sentiments, is not on the part of the sacred writers. Antiquity, apparently, is on the side of the maxims of CONFUCIUS and ZOROASTER; but it is reduced to a matter of doubt whether they can date back to the organization of the early Christian church. There are a characteristic beauty and an elegance in the Holy Scriptures which are not found in the naked and cold axioms of the founders of idolatrous creeds. The lofty ideas, the exalted conceptions, the richness of language, and the inspiration of soul, which are peculiar to the compositions of prophets and apostles, are not to be discovered in the opinions of men who lived in the midnight of heathenism. We see nothing of the humility of humanity, of the sublimity of an atoning death, and victory over death, which are so strongly portrayed in the life, sufferings, and death of JESUS CHRIST. We see nothing of the power of what is termed conversion—that is, a change from debasement and wretchedness to elevation and happiness—nothing of that undefinable feeling which subdues the agony and terrors of death, and opens a sure and radiant path from dishonor to glory. In the profane compositions of CONFUCIUS and ZOROASTER, we may discover some of the seeds of the gospel, rudely sown; but in the parables and sermons of the God-man, we cannot detect the morals and dogmas of Gentile priests and astrologers. There is something stoical and lofty in these time-worn truths—something that tells of superior wisdom, and stern, unbending integrity; but there is nothing that can

bear a comparison with that law of the LORD which is perfect, converting the soul—those maxims of JEHOVAH which are sublime, giving peace and consolation to the simple.

The Scriptures are like light breaking in upon darkness: sitting in darkness, the soul sees a great light; and, inhabiting a region like unto the valley of the shadow of death, light springs forth. The Scriptures are like musical strains falling upon the dreadful stillness of a dungeon: the captive rises, listens, and, with hands uplifted and eyes streaming with tears, rejoices at strains so sweet. The Scriptures are like liberty in a land shrouded in civil darkness: they speak of a final emancipation, and point to a noble and speedy deliverance.

H. B.

LETTERS UPON PHYSICO-THEOLOGY, OR
NATURAL THEOLOGY;

Demonstrating the being and attributes of the Deity by the works of his creation.

BY PETER A. BROWNE, L. L. D.

Designed for the instruction of his grandchildren.

“How much wiser and how much better should we be, if out of everything that surrounds we were to draw the high moral that is to be found in the works of God! Who would dare do wrong, if he saw the hand of God close to him in every event of existence?”

LETTER II.

OF THE POWER OF GOD, PROVED BY ASTRONOMY.

(Continued.)

My dear children: In the first essay, we contemplated this earth as if it had been at *rest*. Another method of endeavoring to estimate the *power* of the Almighty, is to consider it (as it is) in *motion*.

The solid contents of the earth are no less than two hundred and sixty-three billions, eight hundred and fifty-eight millions, one hundred and forty-nine thousands, and one hundred and twenty cubical miles. And supposing the whole density to be only two-and-a-half times greater than water, it would weigh two thousand two hundred millions of millions of millions of tons!

But this immense ball is not at *rest*. Whether it was created at rest and was set in motion, or was created in motion, no man can tell! For although, when we perceive anything in motion, we are led to be-

lieve that there must have been some immediate and visible existing cause for the same, yet, in philosophical truth, *motion* is as *natural* as *rest*.

NEWTON supposed that GOD, at the creation, exerted the power to set the planets in motion. If so, what an example of immense power, to move two thousand two hundred millions of millions of millions of tons!

But Jupiter is thirteen hundred times larger than this earth; and, estimating their specific gravity as equal, he must weigh thirteen hundred times as much as this earth, or twenty-eight thousand six hundred millions of millions of millions of tons. And the same almighty hand that set this earth in motion, performed the same miracle for Jupiter.

So all the rest of the eleven primary planets, and their eighteen satellites, as well as the comets and meteors, are in motion; and the Sun himself, around whom they all revolve, is not at rest.

Figures can no longer be used to estimate the weight of this immense mass of ponderable matter, set in motion (according to the notions of NEWTON) by the *power* of GOD.

Nor is it necessary to have recourse to the other systems, as we might well do; for the hundreds of thousands of fixed stars (so called) are not fixed, but are also moveable: and their motions are assignable to the same GREAT FIRST CAUSE.

Enough has been said, it is hoped, to show the great power of the Almighty, as thus exhibited in "THE BOOK OF NATURE," upon studying the *motions* of the planets.

It will be now necessary to say a few words in regard to the *directions* of all these immense bodies, which are not only in *motion*, but each one pursues the path assigned to it at the creation. In order to estimate the value of the *order* in which they move, we must remember that within the circumference of Uranus—which is something more than one thousand millions of miles—these eleven primary planets, and their eighteen satellites, continually have rolled since the beginning, and continually may roll for countless ages, without any danger of confusion. Yet the slightest variation of the forces by which they are impelled, or the suspension or diminution of the power for the shortest period of time, would be certain destruction to the universal system.

Is it not wonderful that so insignificant a being as man, inhabiting so small a speck in this great universe as is this earth, should presume

to disobey the laws of so *mighty a one* as He who rules and governs this *vast kingdom*?

I fear that sufficient pains are not taken to teach children the GREAT POWER of the Almighty, as displayed in these his wonderful works.

They should be instructed early to peruse "THE BOOK OF NATURE," and be shown how to draw therefrom lessons in PHYSICO-THEOLOGY.

LITERATURE, ETC.

MYSTERIES OF PARNASSUS.—CHAPTER IV.

BY REV. J. P. M.

We will now notice the personal preparation of the Pythian, before she ascended the tripod. In advance of this, however, it will be necessary to remark that not only presents, in gold, &c., were required of those who consulted the Oracle, but sacrifices of animals were deemed absolutely necessary. Indeed, no one presumed to approach the sanctuary who had not sacrificed; for without this Apollo was deaf, and the Pythian was dumb. To aid in this religious ceremony, there were attached to the Oracle five sacrificers, or prophets. These were supposed to be men of approved sanctity, and were the medium of communication between the Pythian and the people, as we shall presently see. In addition to these, there were other ministers, also called prophets. The first class of these were the Hyperboreans, who had crossed the sea, and settled on Mount Parnassus. This dignity was ever after conferred upon the principal inhabitants of Delphi.

The Pythian's preparation was simply this: she fasted three days, bathed in the water brought from the Castalian fountain, and ate of the laurel leaves plucked from trees which grew near the margin of the stream.

The day of consultation having arrived, Apollo gave notice of his presence in condescending to cut a laurel which grew near the temple, as well also as by shaking the edifice to its very foundations. Then it was that the Pythian felt in herself that the god was present. The chief prophets conducted her to the sanctuary and placed her upon the tripod, where she sat in a position most convenient for receiving its divine vapour, which, like a penetrating fire, soon diffused itself through her whole frame. Then her hair was seen to rise up. Her look was fierce. She foamed and trembled, and would sometimes attempt to tear herself away from the prophets, who retained her by force

upon the tripod. Then it was that her dreadful screams pealed through the temple, and cast a solemn awe over the minds of the prophets and the people. She felt as if she had thrown aside her mortality. She professed now to count the grains of sand on the sea-shore, and measure the immensity of the oceans. All ages, all times, all destinies, were collected together within her bosom, and prevented the full powers of her articulation! At intervals, she uttered a few words, imperfectly articulated, like one in a mesmeric slumber. The prophets noted every syllable with great care, and afterwards arranged them in poetic measure, and in this manner answered the questions of the too credulous inquirer. After the Pythian had been sufficient time upon the tripod to give all the responses, the prophets conveyed her back to her cell, where she remained until perfectly recovered from the effects of her excitement, though sometimes a sudden death was the price or penalty of her enthusiasm.

In addition to the Pythians, there was another class of females attached to the temple, whose duty it was to watch and keep up the sacred fire, day and night. The Delphians did not choose for this service virgins, as was the case in Rome, but widows, as was the custom in Athens. Without the sanctuary, on its steps, were to be seen a line of females extending from the outer to the inner door. There were also in the service of the temple, and attached to it, a college of diviners, a choir of boys and girls, and a band of musicians. Indeed, nothing could be more complete, or more imposing, than the ceremonies connected with the worship and consultation of Apollo at Parnassus. To complete the whole, near the entrance of the temple dwelt a minister, whose office it was to guard the treasure and make the disbursements. He arose with the sun, and swept the temple with laurel branches, cut near the Castalian fountain, and afterwards attached crowns of laurel to the doors, walls, altars, and tripod. He also distributed branches of the same to the prophets, poets, and other ministers. In addition to this, he filled the vases with holy water, for the use of ministers and people, ere they entered the temple. In a word, no heathen worship could have been more complete, no ceremonial more imposing, for the gratification of the superstitious taste and ready credulity of the multitude who assembled beneath its dome. But when the light of cherubic glory burst upon the plains of Bethlehem, and the true Oracle spoke of the unity and spirituality of *the one living and true God*, the effulgence of Apollo became dim, and the voice of the Pythian was heard no more. And now, not even a crumbling column remains to point the classic wanderer to the site where once stood this famous

structure. Even its ruins have vanished; and its history is so thickly enshrouded in obscurity, as to render the selection of truth from fiction a very difficult, if not an impossible task.

PERSICO'S INDIAN FEMALE STATUE.

BY REV. MR. S.

The writer of the following has read various remarks and discussions, in the periodicals of the day, respecting the Indian female statue beside that of Columbus, on the eastern front of the Capitol. These remarks and discussions, however, have, with one exception, been of a very general or evasive nature, in one important particular. And the writer is free to confess, that he should be glad to see the subject more fully, fairly, and discriminately handled, in order that a clear and fair estimate may be formed of the merits of the case, and that the public sentiment and judgment may become established on some sure basis.

But before proceeding further, let it be asked, What *are* the *particulars*, or *chief points* of discussion now at issue? Let these be distinctly understood; for this here, as in most cases, will save much of thought, time, and words.

And here we may lay out of view entirely, as unconnected with the question before us, all that has been or may be said respecting the excellence of the statue, or of the group, as a work of art. The question is not, here, whether the artist has or has not succeeded in producing a statue in accordance with ancient *classical taste*, or has or has not met the approval of good living judges in Italy or in this country in respect to its *main* design and execution, but *without respect* to the *position* it was to occupy, or the *peculiarities* of the race it was to represent. In respect to the former, the decisions of opinion may have been favorable, and the approval in general satisfactory or otherwise, and yet not at all decide the present question.

What is then the question to be discussed? It relates, I apprehend, especially, and in plain terms, to the *extent* of the *nakedness* of this female statue, taken in connexion with its present *publicly exposed position*.

The subject being thus presented, the writer of this would first premise, (as it may justly be matter of criticism,) Does the statue in question, in its present state, and in *respect to its nudity and exposure*, justly represent any characteristic of the American Indian female? It is a just axiom, that the perfection of art is to copy nature. Equally true

is it (as I presume will at once be admitted) that the perfection of the representation by statue of the characteristics, genius, or habits of any people, is to *copy the nearest possible*, so as to exhibit the characteristics, genius, or habits of that people. A question then at once arises, Does any thing in the well-known traits of character, or habits of thinking or acting, or ideas of what is meet and proper, or any historical incident of the original inhabitants of this country, warrant, under any circumstances, by way of representation, such naked exposure of the female form? On the contrary, to speak from matters of fact and real life, was it not a well-known characteristic of the Indian female to be *timid, reserved*, and even *shy*, and especially as to exposure before strangers? And is not the idea of being taken by surprise, as a reason for such exposure, met by another well-known trait of the Indian character—*not to be taken by surprise*, or, if this should ever occur, *never so unguardedly to betray emotions of it*? Hence, then, the question—following out what is real and consistent in the Indian character—Why this *almost entire nudity, thus publicly exposed*? Why not at least permit something like the well-known belt, or girdle, wrought in a manner and form ingenious and peculiar to their race, and always worn, and by which their race was particularly distinguished? If a Grecian female were to be represented by statue, would not the drapery exhibited be expected to be evidently Grecian?—or an Egyptian, should not the drapery be Egyptian?—or Persian, Turkish, or European, should not the drapery show itself to be Persian, Turkish, or European? In like manner, would not the perfection of a statue of an American Indian female require the characteristic drapery of her people?

But, leaving the discussion of this particular, let us pass to the direct and much more important point in question—the *propriety*, to say the least, of the *extent of the nudity and exposure* of this statue, in its present position.

In deciding this point, I apprehend that the *general sense and moral feeling* of the community, and the *influence* on the community, where the statue is located, are to be taken fully into the account. And it may justly be questioned whether the artists concerned, or connoisseurs, should be regarded as the best judges in the case—and especially if in opposition to the general moral feeling of the community, and not sensible, like that community, of the influence such nude and exposed statuary may exert.

Accordingly, we may lay it down as a *just principle*, that if it be the *general moral sense and feeling* of an intelligent and enlightened community that such statues, so exposed, have a tendency and influence,

even in the least degree, instead of elevating the tone of moral feeling, to lower it, then such moral sense and feeling may be justly maintained and defended, and should be so, against all opposition.

It belongs not to the question, here or now, whether such nudity and exposure have had a purifying or debasing influence on the moral feelings in Europe, or wherever the art of sculpture has been most cultivated, and the exposure most extensive—though it is believed, that a full and fair discussion of this point would show that the influence on the mass of the people, even there, has been injurious, rather than favorable. But if it were otherwise, to decide the question in hand, we have only to look at home. We have only to make full inquiry, and look at facts here. If we have proof full and clear that such nudity and exposure, to the extent in question, do, here in our American community, with the habits, customs, feelings, and sense of propriety in which we have been educated, produce, on the whole, a deleterious rather than a purifying influence, the question would seem to be settled. In enlightened and intelligent minds, there could be but one decision. And no ridicule, no sarcasm, nor other attempts to lessen or do away this tone of moral feeling, should be allowed to prevail.

And that the influence in this case is deleterious, rather than purifying, we have proof, first, in the testimony of the intelligent generally of both sexes, and from almost all sections of our country—from the refined capital of the Bay State to the commercial emporium of the South, and the Queen City of the West—including especially heads of families, and heads of our public seminaries, who know best the tendency and effects on the susceptible minds, imaginations, and feelings of youth. From all such, with scarcely an exception, we have heard but one expression (of approbation indeed of the statuary in general, but) of *disapprobation*, and strongly expressed feelings of the *impropriety*, to say the least, of the *extreme nudity* and *exposure* of the Indian female figure.

And that this feeling, deeply seated, pervades almost our entire community, wherever the subject has been duly considered, and needs only the opportunity of being brought out in order to *express* decidedly the same testimony, is, and will be, evident to all who take the trouble to make the necessary inquiry. Expressions of opinion to the contrary are comparatively few.

But still further in respect to the influence mentioned. Is it not matter of common notoriety, that our youth, confessedly susceptible, and easily receiving evil impressions, are often, while standing and viewing this (in many respects) fine piece of art, exposed to the hear-

ing of unchaste remarks and witticisms, and obscene jests, *occasioned* by the *nudeness* and *exposure* before them, and which would not be the case, were a remedy provided? And can our youth be thus exposed and feel no debasing influence? Can the discreet father and mother, even, accompany their youthful family of sons and daughters, and youthful visitors, to view this statue, and feel that there is nothing improper, nothing indiscreet, nothing that in their young imaginations may afterwards have an injurious tendency—and in a particular, too, respecting which (such is human nature) parents know well the necessity of throwing around them all the guards that are practicable?

And how is it in respect to ladies—not prudes, but the cultivated and intelligent daughters of the land, with the chaste sensibilities and discreet deportment so noticed and esteemed by intelligent foreigners, and for which I trust they will ever be distinguished? How is it with them, on passing with gentlemen from the noble rotundo, and coming unawares directly in rear of the statue in question? Is it not the fact, that, notwithstanding all the self-command and skillful evasion they can assume, they cannot restrain the deep blush and chagrin, but seek retreat as speedily and with as little ado as possible? Reference is here made to no imaginary, nor even single cases. They are the admitted realities of almost every day's experience. And the argument compels one, though endeavoring to avoid all indelicate allusions, to state thus plainly what is so generally known, seen, and felt.

It is no valid answer to the foregoing considerations and facts, for the artist or connoisseur to say, Such are not the effects with me, but the contrary. The physician, and surgeon, and general scholar, may say the same respecting their branches of professional research and minute knowledge of the whole human frame; but what would be thought of the proposal to exhibit the results of their acquired knowledge openly before the whole community?

Nor is it any sufficient answer to say, (as has been said,) "To the pure, all things are pure"—thus applying the passage in a manner altogether foreign from its original import. For this course of argument would go to remove all restrictions, not only in respect to all such nude statues, but in respect to all like full and public exposures of the human form, male and female, by the sister art of painting, and also of lithographic prints: so that our various public places of resort, and retail shops, might exhibit them, without restraint of law, or custom, or public moral sentiment. Such would be the direct tendency of this argument; and its demoralizing effects, who will pretend to deny?

Nor, finally, is it any valid reason for such exposure, to say, "If the refinements of the world did not abide the truth, (just quoted,) where would be the Venus at Florence, the great Apollo, the Laocoon, or the Eve of our own POWERS?" It may well be answered, without detracting at all from the art, or the object of such statues, *Where, indeed, but in museums and galleries?*—and not promiscuously exposed to public view even there, but in comparatively retired apartments, or *niches*, as is very properly the case in other like instances in this country. And even in many of the cities of Italy, where many things are permitted at which visitors from this country shrink back, or at least experience uneasy sensations,—even there, such statues as this are not generally exposed *in the manner, and to the extent*, of this at our own Capitol. Nor are they there, even, generally visited by gentlemen and ladies promiscuously. Sentiments of female delicacy there do not seem to tolerate that. In proof of which, a late naval officer said to the writer, (and the like has been repeatedly stated by others,) "As we were on a visit to the celebrated statuary at Naples, with the officers of the squadron, and with ladies—some of them from the royal family—we were led to examine in course, and with deep interest, those various noble specimens of art; but when, at length, intimation was given in respect to visiting the apartments, or *niches*, of the nude statues—as the Venus, and the like—the ladies at once retired." Thus, even foreign sentiment and example, it is believed, *instead of approval*, would furnish a *reproof* of this *so peculiarly exposed nude statue*—attracting special attention, and to be visited almost necessarily by companies of both sexes, if visited at all.

— Leaving out of view, then, what pertains not to the subject here in discussion, and keeping before the mind the point or points really at issue,—and giving to a *moral and enlightened* community the right of deciding what is meet and proper, and also what is the *actual influence* in the case,—it would seem that the foregoing considerations and statements could lead to but one conclusion, and that conclusion would seem evidently to be—the call for a remedy.

Georgetown, D. C., Dec. 30, 1845.

THE HON. MR. RATHBUN'S REPORT
ON CLERK AND MESSENGER SKINNING.

We had intended to remark in detail on the report of the Hon. Mr. RATHBUN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, of the 31st December, accompanying the *bill for skinning the clerks, &c.*; but we find that we have neither time nor space for so much. We will therefore confine ourselves, *for the present*, to a few of the most prominent points. The object to be effected is, *the reduction of pay, increase of labor, and a very short term of service.* We do not think the positions assumed in the report are sustained either by the facts or arguments. Let us here, in the outset, assure our readers that we have no design to impugn the motives of the honorable gentleman. It were ungenerous and unreasonable to suppose them otherwise than patriotic. We do not know, however, that the bill, *as reported*, will affect any of his relations. But we regret the inauspicious bias of his mind, and think it unfortunate—less so for him, indeed, than for the clerks and messengers, and much less so for them than for the country—that he did not, previously to writing that report, make himself a *little* acquainted with the duties and responsibilities of the assailed officers. Had he done this, however, we should have been spared the trouble of these remarks.

Mr. RATHBUN deprecates the *abject and servile* condition to which the mind becomes reduced *by long continuance in office.* (We would not insinuate that we suppose he states this from his own experience, or that of his near relations.) We will take courage, nevertheless, from it, and talk like an independent private citizen and a democrat.

The report says: "The man who enters upon the duties of an office with the certainty that, in a few years, he is to surrender it to a successor, will ordinarily endeavor to save some portion of his earnings, to enable him to engage in some other business, on his own account, more profitably than he otherwise could."

Now, we would like to know how much money Mr. RATHBUN thinks a clerk or messenger with a family (and most of them have *large* families) could save under his system. He requires them to be appointed for *four years*, with eligibility for reappointment *one term only*, and their pay to be regulated by the Ohio standard. According to this, an auditor should be paid about \$1,000—chief clerk \$600—other clerks \$500—and messengers about \$300. Now let us see. Will you allow them to live as comfortably as respectable journeymen mechanics and apprentice boys live? If so, let us take the family to a respectable

boarding house for such persons. They *must* board; for, when appointed, most clerks have no money nor furniture, and are in debt, and a whole year's salary, if one could get it advanced, would not furnish his house; and if he went in debt for so much, how could he expect ever to pay? Well, we have got the family at the door of the genteel boarding house for apprentices, &c.

Clerk.—What will you board us for, madam, by the week or month?

Landlady.—How many are you, sir?

Clerk.—Well, I don't know—but there's myself and wife, and about half-a-dozen children, and perhaps a small girl to nurse the youngest.

Landlady.—O, dear me! children are so troublesome! I'd rather have grown single people, a great deal.

Clerk.—That's odd. Why, grown single people require a room a piece, and I only want two rooms for all of us.

Landlady.—Why, la! sir, you are mistaken. I put seven or eight, and sometimes a dozen single people in a room. I could give you two rooms—but then you'll have to pay more.

Clerk.—Pray tell me, madam, what will I have to pay?

Landlady.—Well, sir, you must pay three dollars a week for yourself and lady, and half price all round for the rest.

Clerk.—[Calculates: Three and three are six, and the six children and little girl \$1.50 each, \$10.50. In all, sixteen dollars and a half per week.] Why, madam, that's enormous! What! sixteen dollars and a half for *only nine* people, and one of them a little servant, and six nothing but children, of one, three, five, seven, ten, twelve years old! and only for a week! That's about \$73 per month! [Aside—musing. Speaks aside—seventy-three dollars per month! *Eight hundred and seventy-six* dollars a year! Lord bless my soul! what a set of extortioners! sharpers! Eight hundred and seventy-six for nine only! Just \$376 more than all my salary, and nothing said about fuel and lights!] No, madam, that is entirely too much: I cannot give it, or anything like it.

Landlady.—Are you a member, sir? I'll board you for less, if you'll all occupy one room.

Clerk.—What! Myself, and my wife, and six children, and nurse, all in one room! Why I couldn't stand it, any how. You people seem to think that no one is entitled to comforts but members of Congress. But what would you ask, supposing we *could* all occupy the same room?—a thing we never did, and can't do, though I am not a member.

Landlady.—Well, sir, I'll take you for fifty dollars a month; and that's the lowest cent.

Clerk.—[Aside. Fifty dollars a month—or \$600 a year! still a whole hundred more than my salary, and nothing said about wood and lights! What on earth shall I do? O friend RATHBUN! friend RATHBUN! I wish you had been in Liberia when you reported that cursed bill! But what's to be done? Here I'm living at COLEMAN'S, *like a gentleman*, at as much per week as I get per month. It must be so no longer, or I'll be head and ears in debt; and if I close with this house, I shall be in just as bad a box in a month. *Thinks:* Ah, I have it—I have it. I'll make acquaintance with COLEMAN'S porter. He's quite a genteel looking fellow, and I think he keeps house—or he can recommend me to some of his Irish friends who keep *laboring* men's boarding houses, (for I'm nothing but a laboring man myself, after all;) I'll get in there, or with some respectable colored person, at a half a dollar a piece, perhaps, all round, in one room. That'll be about twenty dollars a month, or \$240 per year. Thus I shall have \$260 left. I must do without fire and light. Of this sum, one hundred dollars must clothe us. Forty must educate the four children. The doctor will have about \$20; the church, *nothing.*] I wish you a good morning, madam; I see we cannot bargain.

Landlady.—Very well, sir; I wouldn't like to have so many children, any how.

As he moves off toward COLEMAN'S, he soliloquizes thus: "By this process, I shall be able to save a hundred dollars a year. My friend RATHBUN will clap his hands for joy. 'Ah!' he'll say, 'I told you so. I knew you could save money. Only see! a hundred dollars a year! at the end of four years, you'll have the handsome sum of \$400 to begin business with. Many a person has made a fortune from a smaller beginning than \$400.' Yes, my friend; but I rather think he hadn't a wife and six children to help him begin, and he was a *little* bit younger than I am, and out of debt. And suppose, after all, I should not be able to get board for fifty cents each per week—and I have heard that no laboring man, white or black, can get board for less than a dollar per week. If I have to pay an additional dollar for myself and wife, there's fifty-two dollars, at the end of the year, smack dab, off of the hundred that I thought was saved. Suppose, also, incidental expenses not to be foreseen. Suppose a child should die, or my wife. Ah, dear me! she's as likely to live as I am! And suppose another should be born before the year ends. All that is possible—probable; and they bring their expenses. My own hundred dollars, to what are you reduced!

And then, there's our daughter Ellen. In four years she'll be sixteen. Who will be her associates during this period? Oh, my friend RATHBUN, I shall go mad. Why did you get me into this scrape?"

"Don't blame me," says friend RATHBUN; "blame Congress, who ordered the bill."

"Ay, sir, but you might have drafted a *civilized* bill."

This is one of the scenes—very imperfectly sketched—that would be the consequence of such a system as the report proposes. So much for Mr. RATHBUN'S *Clerk's Savings Bank*.

Then, in contrast with this beautiful picture of the result of reduced wages, increased labor, and short term of employment, the report goes on to say: "He who obtains an office in which he considers himself established for life, becomes extravagant, inattentive to his business, careless of the public as of his private interests, living from hand to mouth, dependent in his circumstances, *servile in his character, and degraded in his feelings as a man.*"

What think ye, Virginians, of this? Will ye subscribe to this doctrine? If we are not greatly mistaken, your noble State has proved the very reverse of all this to be true. It does not apply, however, at all to the public officers at the seat of government. Every one there knows that he is not appointed for life. Far from it. He knows that he holds his office *at the will* only of the appointing power. The very most that he can *hope* for is, to retain it *during good behaviour*. This is, indeed, a powerful incentive to industry and correct deportment, and a stimulus to labor and action. He very reasonably concludes that the more perfectly he acquaints himself with his duties, and the more assiduously he applies himself to them, the more valuable do they become to the country, and the chances for his continuance and promotion in office are thereby increased. But, take away this incentive, and let him understand that in four years his appointment comes to an end, and that if so fortunate as to secure a reappointment his official relation to the government must forever cease with his second term—let a beloved family be depending on him for support,—and he must be more than human if he do not become selfish and sordid, indifferent to the public interests, "servile in his character, and degraded in his feelings as a man." Yes, if human nature is the same with all men, to secure *the second term*, he will practise, with unwearied diligence, the arts of sycophancy, hypocrisy, and dissimulation. He will argue thus within himself: I am poor; but my family must be provided for. In a few years I must retire from office, poor and dependent. I cannot and must not engage in any other pursuit, as an auxiliary to my salary,

while in a public office. My small salary is all I shall have. Even agencies of every description are prohibited by law and regulations. But something must be saved, or, when I go out of office, I must perish with my family on the highway. To save a few hundred dollars, I must deprive myself and family of every comfort and many of the actual necessities of life. It does not signify, but I *must* do something additional. What does it signify that I owe duties to the state? My obligations to my own family are paramount. Public virtue must yield to private necessity. 'He that provideth not for his own household, is worse than an infidel.' Law or no law, *money must be saved*. What more shall I gain by devotion to the public service? What will it profit me to apply myself with diligence, day after day, and month after month, to become skillful and expert in the performance of my official duties, when, by the time this has been accomplished, I must yield my place to another? This, then, is the conclusion of the matter: I will give as little of my time to the public, and as much to my private affairs, as possible. True, the public will suffer, but I cannot help it; self-preservation is the first law of nature, and I mean to obey it. I might be asked if I am not afraid that my neglect and unskillfulness will be detected. Who is capable of detecting me? As to the first, I guess I am enough of a Yankee to manage that, among a parcel of greenhorns; and as to the second, I have no fears whatever—for *the heads are as green as myself, and will never know any better.*"

We find that we have already exceeded our limits for this number, before getting into the merits of the case. In our next, we intend to show that the ground assumed by Mr. RATHBUN is altogether untenable. The existence of his principal facts—the basis of his superstructure—we shall deny, and will challenge him to the proof, which we almost *know* he will be unable to adduce. Some of his facts we expect even to disprove. We will show also that the comparison instituted between the salaries at the seat of government and those of the State of Ohio, as well as most of the bill itself, is unequal, unfair, and unjust; and that his argument drawn thence is only specious; and that his proposition is inimical to the interests of the people. In the mean time, we would respectfully recommend to all concerned, who would act advisedly and justly in the premises, the perusal of the report of the Hon. Mr. INGERSOLL, of the Committee of Ways and Means, made the 2d March, 1843, on the "classification of clerks, &c." House Doc. No. 294, 3d session 27th Congress.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE.

The following letter from the indefatigable VATTEMARE will be read by the members and friends of the National Institute with pleasure. Whilst it is the latest of many tokens of his zeal, manifested in results of a most generous kind, it also affords new testimony of the enthusiastic approbation with which the claims of the Institute have been greeted by the great and the eminent throughout the world. It is hoped that our countrymen may be incited by such examples to give this important subject the consideration it merits, and that new exertions will be made by them in its behalf. Three bulletins of the proceedings of the Institute are now before the world. These volumes present at once the evidences of triumphant success and the most powerful arguments in its favor.

PARIS, OCTOBER 30, 1845.

My Dear Sir: I have the honor of inclosing herewith the list of the collection of books, medals, &c., given to me for the National Institute, which I have been keeping, waiting for your directions, and which I now send to the Hon. Senator, REVERDY JOHNSON, who saw it encumbering my office, and who generously offered himself to take charge of all the expenses of packing up, transportation, &c. This gentleman will therefore have the pleasure of presenting personally to the National Institute the case containing this collection.

From the above list, the National Institute will perceive that I am constantly thinking and working as much as it is in my humble sphere to promote its welfare, and that its influence is daily increasing, with increasing esteem and respect for the government and scientific powers of the New World.

The moment Congress will have secured its permanent existence, offerings and presents from every part of the world will arrive in Washington, as a proof of the general sympathy felt everywhere for the welfare and glory of the United States, as well as a proof of the indispensableness of the existence of such a central scientific establishment.

Allow me to repeat what I have never ceased to say in all my letters, that all these offerings are made to *the American nation*, represented by the National Institute; that if such establishment did not exist, the works which I procure I never should have received.

May the noble, warm-hearted, and patriotic members of this present Congress listen to the humble suggestion which my long experience and my devotion to the glory of your great country encourage me to make to them; and surely the National Institute will become the powerful medium, and, through the influence of the United States, will spread itself all over the world. Such is my ardent prayer, and the constant aim of my labors and sacrifices.

You know, my dear sir, that the National Institute does not possess a better and more devoted friend than

Your humble and faithful servant,

ALEXANDRE VATTEMARE.

To FRANCIS MARKOE, jr., esq.,

Corresponding Secretary of the National Institute.

Accompanying this letter is a list of the articles referred to, consisting of nearly a hundred items, of books, medals, maps, engravings, statuettes, &c., presented by several ministerial departments, scientific societies, and literary men of France, to the National Institute, through the agency of Mr. VATTEMARE, during the year 1845.

This list occupies nearly ten pages of foolscap paper. The books enumerated are very valuable—being the works of many of the most profoundly learned Frenchmen, on a great variety of the most interesting subjects in the departments of science and literature. There must be several hundred volumes. Among them is the great work—“A Complete Collection *du Journal des Savants*, from 1816 to 1844”—twenty-nine volumes quarto, bound; presented by the *Minister of Justice and Religious Worship*. “The continuation of this work,” it is remarked, “the most important publication of this nature ever published, will be given.”

The books alone—to say nothing of the beautiful medals, engravings, statues, &c.—are worth a large sum; and yet—strange! strange to say!—although the property in all this, and fifty times as much, is in the United States, *Congress has not given a dollar even to pay for the transportation*. We do hope that this Congress will act with more liberality towards the Institute than the preceding ones; for, in so doing, they will do no more than *justice to the people*, whose are all these things. That there should be found *members of Congress* who set their faces against the Institute, is a mystery which we possess no power to solve. They talk of it as if it had been established and were maintained for some *pecuniary* advantage to its members! We would venture our lives, had we a thousand, on the assertion that there has never been a member of the Institute so silly as to calculate on deriving any such benefit from it—unless, at a future day, in common with the whole people, by the general prosperity of the country, increased and strengthened by its operations. Such opposition from monarchists and aristocrats, representing an ignorant and down-trodden people, would create no surprise; for it is the interest of such to keep the key of knowledge from the multitude: but to what motive can be ascribed the opposition of men imbued with the sacred principles of a free and

equal government, the very foundation of which is knowledge, representing a free and intelligent people, to an institution, the sole object of which—like that of the philanthropic SMITHSON—is, the *increase and diffusion of knowledge*, and the elevation of the working classes, that thereby, while all partake of higher intellectual enjoyments, our republican institutions may be perpetuated? Let them answer to their constituents and their own consciences.

We are glad of this opportunity to present to our readers an extract from an article of the very highest order, on the subject of the National Institute, in the "Southern Quarterly Review" for October, 1845, by that finished scholar and elegant writer, Dr. LEWIS R. GIBBES, of Columbia, S. C. We could wish heartily that every member of Congress, every citizen of the United States, would read the whole article:

"We are of that class who believe, with Bacon, that knowledge is emphatically power,—and that we cannot estimate it by money. We believe that in governments, education is of paramount importance, and that appropriations of money for its advancement are well laid out, however liberal they may be. Here, no majority has any greater interests than minorities,—all are equally interested in the diffusion of what is to give them power.

"'Give the people knowledge,' " should be the motto of all parties, and republicanism and liberty of thought and liberty of action will have stronger safeguards added to them. Our people have patriotism and intelligence, and they need only cultivation to improve upon their Anglo-Saxon origin, of which they have reason to be proud. Our national literature, and we may begin to say science, need but nursing, to compare with those of any country under heaven. The fine arts of the United States have been represented by an Allston, confessedly, a few years since, the first of living painters; and sculpture has her Powers, almost without a rival.

* * * * *

"We come now to the consideration of the propriety of Congress aiding, by appropriations of money, the continuance and expansion of the National Institute. Their present fund is derived from the annual contribution of five dollars from each resident member, and is wholly inadequate to the ordinary current expenses.

"Our own citizens, from all parts of the Union, foreign governments, and distinguished societies, men of science and eminence in all departments of knowledge, have contributed to form a great NATIONAL MUSEUM;—can our government provide for its care?"

We have something to say on the subject of the Smithsonian institution, but are obliged to defer it till the next number.